

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the April 2, 2007 Final Office action and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as presented and in light of the following remarks. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14, and 16 are presented in the application for further examination. **Applicants submit that this Amendment B raises no new issues that would require further search and raises no issue of new matter.** Rather, this Amendment B places the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. Applicants respectfully request that favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks and the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance if necessary.

Applicants acknowledge the Office's acceptance of the drawings.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chasen et al. (US Patent No. 6,760,721). Applicants submit that Chasen fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims for at least the following reasons. In particular, Applicants disagree with the Office's reading and understanding of Chasen. The Office disagreed with Applicants previous argument on pages 16-17 of the Office action and submitted that Chasen discloses or suggests the feature of "parsing the first property data included in the first metadata field; identifying a property delimiter included in the first property data in the first metadata field..." In finding the support for such argument, the Office argues that the "parsing feature" is also viewed as "the systems['] traversal of tree [sic] master tree 122, grouping tree 124, and playlist 126 to identify the CLEAN and DIRTY flag or delimiter)." Office action, page 3. With respect to the "identifying a property delimiter" feature, the Office argues that "the property delimiter corresponds to a CLEAN or DIRTY delimiter that has been applied to any metadata or data changes by the user, wherin the system marks a node with a CLEAN or DIRTY status)". Office action, page 17.

Claim 1 is recited as:

A method for displaying metadata of a media file being stored in a memory, said media file having a first metadata field including a first property data, and having a second metadata

field including a second property data, each property data defining a property of the media file, respectively, comprising:

- identifying a first property category from the first metadata field of the media file;
- parsing the first property data included in the first metadata field;
- identifying a property delimiter included in the first property data in the first metadata field;
- identifying a first property and a second property based on the identified property delimiter from the parsed first property data, wherein the property delimiter separates the identified first property from the identified second property; and
- displaying the identified first property category, the identified first property, and the identified second property in hierarchically organized levels via a graphical user interface, wherein the identified property category is displayed as a first level of the hierarchically organized levels, and wherein the identified first property and the identified second property are displayed as a second level of the hierarchically organized levels.”

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the Office fails to give full weight to the language of the claims and the previous amendments. The Office’s argument is flawed because the “CLEAN” and “DIRTY” status is not a property delimiter **included in the first property data** as recited by the claims. The “CLEAN” and “DIRTY” status is **in response to a change of data made by a user and is added/noted to the node to indicate whether the node has been changed**. For example, in FIG. 6 of Chasen, at state 610, “the data change process 216 receives a user’s changes to data and proceeds to a state 620.” Chasen, col. 16, lines 3-5. “If anything in the node has been changed, the data change process proceeds to a state 650 wherein a Node State is set to DIRTY, and proceeds to a state 670.” *Id.*, at lines 13-16. In other words, “DIRTY” status does not serve as a “**delimiter**” to the data in the node, but, rather, a data status indicator. In fact, “DIRTY” or “CLEAN” status is merely a node state. The data in the node remains to identify one property. The Office also admitted that the DIRTY or CLEAN is a flag on page 3 of the Office action.

In addition, claim 1 recites, “the property delimiter **separates** the identified first property from the identified second property.” To the contrary, “DIRTY” or “CLEAN” status merely notes whether the data has been changed or modified by the user. The Office’s understanding of a first property and a second property is erroneous. The Office viewed “Debussy, Mozart, Rachmaninoff or audio tracks classified in a node, wherein Debussy, Mozart, Rachmaninoff or an audio track can be a first property that maintains a CLEAN status or delimiter” is the first property and “Debussy, Mozart, Rachmaninoff or audio tracks classified in a node, wherein Debussy, Mozart, Rachmaninoff or an audio track can be a first property that maintains a DIRTY

status or delimiter” is the second property. However, in a given node, the data status is either “CLEAN” or “DIRTY.” Furthermore, claim 1 discloses the property delimiter **separates** the first property and the second property. If adopting the Office’s reading of the claim, “DIRTY” or “CLEAN” status (i.e., “property delimiter”) separates “Debussy, Mozart, Rachmaninoff or audio track information” from the second property. However, the data status could either be “CLEAN” or “DIRTY” and if a data is deemed “CLEAN,” there would be no data in the same node that is “DIRTY.” Therefore, the Office’s reasoning of the first property and the second property is inaccurate and illogical. Chasen’s “DIRTY” or “CLEAN” status does not divide/separate the node into two different nodes or separates data in the same node. Therefore, Chasen cannot anticipate claim 1.

Thus, Chasen fails to disclose either the “first property”, “the second property”, or “the property delimiter separates the first property from the second property.” Because Chasen fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. Dependent claims 2-3 and 5 add additional features to claim 1 and are also patentable over the cited art. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Also, claim 8 recites similar limitations as in claim 1 and, for at least the same reasons above, is patentable over Chasen because Chasen fails to disclose or suggest the features of “identifying instructions for identifying **a property delimiter** included in the first property data in the first metadata field; identifying instructions for identifying **a first property** and **a second property** based on the identified property delimiter from the parsed first property data, wherein the property delimiter separates the identified first property from the identified second property...” (emphasis added). Not only does Chasen fail to disclose or suggest the property delimiter, Chasen also fails to disclose or suggest the delimiter separates a first property and a second property from the parsed first property data. Therefore, Chasen cannot anticipate claim 1. Claims 9-10 include features not taught by Chasen. Hence, the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) must be withdrawn.

Similarly, for at least the reasons above, independent claim 14 recites features described above and is also patentable over the cited art. Claim 16 depends from claim 14 and is also

patentable. Therefore, the rejection of claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasen in view of Dwek et al. (US Patent No. 6,248,946). Claims 6 and 7 depend the independent claim 1, claims 12 and 13 depend from the independent claim 8, and claim 16 depends from the independent claim 14. Applicants submit that Dwek fails to cure the deficiencies of Chasen, and that the combined references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims for at least the reasons above. In particular, although Dwek relates to subgenres, Dwek fails to disclose at least the features of parsing the first property data included in the first metadata field, identifying **a property delimiter** included in the first property data in the first metadata field; identifying **a first property** and **a second property** based on the identified property delimiter from the parsed first property data, wherein the property delimiter separates the identified first property from the identified second property. Hence, the combined references of Chasen and Dwek do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16. Because the Office fails to establish the *prima facie* elements of an obviousness rejection, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14, and 16 are clearly distinguishable and are allowable over the cited art. It is felt that the above amendments do not introduce new elements or features of the coverage of the invention as claimed. It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon by the Office in the Office and have determined that none of these references anticipate or make obvious the recited invention in light of the foregoing amendment. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner

deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Applicants do not believe a fee is due. If, however, the Commissioner determines otherwise, other deficient fees may be charged during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



Tan-Chi Yuan, Limited Recognition, No. L0113
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/ATY/tmg

Via EFS